

Amdt. dated November 17, 2010  
Reply to Office action of Aug. 17, 2010

Serial No. 10/596,588  
Docket No. P22626  
Firm No. 0077.0165

**Amendments to the Drawings**

Submitted herewith is a replacement sheet for FIG. 11.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The arguments and amendments presented herein include the arguments and amendments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during phone interview dated November 5, 2010. The Examiner requested Applicants to submit the discussed arguments and amendments for reconsideration, which Applicants present herein. Applicants submit that the arguments and amendments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. If the Examiner believes that further information on the interview needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

Applicants submit that any amendment to the claims herein does not comprise acquiescence or admission that any canceled, amended or supplemented subject matter that existed prior to the amendments herein is not patentable. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claimed subject matter as presented prior to the amendments herein during subsequent prosecution of the present application and in any continuation or related applications.

Applicants submit herewith a replacement sheet for FIG. 11 labeling FIG. 11 as “Prior Art” to overcome the drawings objection on pg. 2 of OA1.

1. Amended Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, par. 2

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 14-19, 21, 27-32 as indefinite (35 U.S.C. §112, par. 2). (OA1, pg. 2) Applicants amend independent claims 1, 14, and 27 to provide antecedent basis for the “local device” element. A “local device” is disclosed in at least para. 19 of the filed Specification.

Applicants amend claim 21 as the Examiner proposed to depend from claim 20 to correct the antecedent basis.

Applicants submit that these amendments overcome the Sec. 112 rejection.

2. Amended claims 27-39 Comply with 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 27-39 as directed to non-statutory subject matter (35 U.S.C. §101) on the grounds that the claims are not limited to statutory subject matter. (OA1, pg. 4)

During the phone interview, the Examiner suggested amending claims 27 and 33 to recite that the “article of manufacture” comprises a “computer readable medium”. Para. 31 of the filed Specification defines “computer readable medium” to comprise statutory tangible media.

During the phone interview, the Examiner stated that this amendment would overcome the Sec. 101 rejection.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the Sec. 101 rejection be withdrawn in view of these amendments.

3. Amended Claims 1-39 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1-39 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102) by Patel (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0157089). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 recite installing a program with a base computer, having a local device, wherein the base computer is adapted to access to a shared folder accessible to the client computers over a network, wherein installing the program on the base computer adds shared application components including executable files for the program to the shared folder and adds local application components of the program to the local device used by the base computer, and wherein installing the program enables the base computer to run the program by accessing by accessing the shared application components and local application components of the program in the shared folder and in the local device; creating an image of the local device of the base computer including the local application components of the program; and providing the image to the client computers to apply the local application components of the program to local devices of the client computers, wherein applying the image to the local devices of the client computers enables the client computers to access the shared application components in the shared folder to run the program, wherein the clients execute the local application components and the shared application components to run the program.

Applicants amend these claims to add the requirements that the base computer adds shared application components including executable files for the program to the shared folder and adds local application components of the program to the local device used by the base computer, and installing the program enables the base computer to run the program by accessing the shared application components and local application components of the program in the shared folder and in the local device, that the client computers apply the local application

components of the program to local devices of the client computers, and that the clients access the local application components and the shared application components to run the program. These added requirements are disclosed in at least FIG. 1 and paras. 15, 16, 21, and 23 of the filed Specification.

The Examiner cited paras. 459 and 460 of Patel as disclosing the pre-amended installing limitation (OA1, pg. 5), which as amended recites installing a program with a base computer, having a local device, wherein the base computer is adapted to access to a shared folder accessible to the client computers over a network, wherein installing the program on the base computer adds shared application components including executable files for the program to the shared folder and adds local application components of the program to the local device used by the base computer, and wherein installing the program enables the base computer to run the program by accessing the shared application components and local application components of the program in the shared folder and in the local device. Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claim.

The cited para. 459 mentions that the AppInstallBlock code is created by a builder program that monitors the installation process of a local version of application installation program and records changes to the system, including environmental variables added or removed from the system or files added or modified in system directories. Files added to the application directory are not recorded. The builder profiles the application to obtain critical pages needed to run application. The cited para. 460 mentions that the AppInstallBlock and runtime data are packaged into Streamed Application Set (SAS) by the builder and uploaded to the application server. After the client is subscribed to an application and before the application runs, the AppInstallBlock is sent by the server to the client. The SAS client invokes the default and application specific initialization code. The default and application specific procedure from the server process the data to make the machine ready for streaming that application.

The cited paras. 459-460 discuss how to stream an application from a server to a client. The cited paras. 459-460 do not disclose the claim requirements that the base computer add shared application components, including executable files for the program, to a shared folder, and adds local application components of the program to install to a local device of the base computer. Instead, the cited paras. 459-460 of Patel discuss how a builder profiles an application and packages runtime data into an SAS to upload on the server for the client to

stream. There is no disclosure of the claim requirements of how shared application components used to execute the program are added to a shared folder the clients accesses to run the program and local application components are added to the local device of the base computer to be provided to add to the local devices of the client computers. For instance, the Examiner has not shown where Patel discloses that the server install local application components in a local device of the server and shared application components in a shared folder that the clients, to which the application is deployed, access to run the application, such that both the local and shared application components are executed to run the application.

The Examiner cited para. 460 as disclosing the pre-amended providing the image limitation (OA1, pg. 5), which as amended recites providing the image to the client computers to apply the local application components of the program to local devices of the client computers, wherein applying the image to the local devices of the client computers enables the client computers to access the shared application components in the shared folder to run the program, wherein the clients execute the local application components and the shared application components to run the program.

As mentioned, the cited para. 460 discusses how to make a machine ready for streaming a particular application. This does not disclose that the image is provided to client computers to apply local application components of the program to local devices of the client computers, and that the client computers access the shared application components in the shared folder, including executable files, to run the program, where the clients execute both their local application components and the shared application components in the shared folder, placed there by the base computer from which the image was generated. For instance, the Examiner has not shown where Patel discloses that the server add shared application components to the shared folder, and that clients that apply the image of the local application components execute both the local application components from their local devices and shared application components from the same shared folder to run the program.

Accordingly, claims 1, 14, and 27 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Patel does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-6, 15-19, and 28-32 are patentable over the cited art because the base claims 1, 14, and 27, from which they depend, are patentable over the cited art, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base and any intervening claims provide

further grounds of patentability over the cited art. Moreover, the following claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 5, 18, and 31 depend from claims 1, 14, and 27, respectively, and further require that the image includes a driver that when loaded into the client computers causes the client computers to perform: intercepting a write request to a requested shared file in the shared folder; generate a mapping of the shared file to a local copy of the shared file in the local devices of the client computers; and applying the write to the local copy of the shared file in the local devices.

These claims are amended to recite that the local copy of the mapping is in the local devices of the client computers. This added requirement is disclosed in at least FIG. 8 and para. 25 of the filed Specification.

The Examiner cited para. 258 of Patel as disclosing the requirements of these claims. (OA1, pg. 7). Applicants traverse.

The cited para. 258 mentions that the application server only services read requests with writes being handled on the client itself in a copy-on-write manner. Para. 211 of Patel mentions that a copy-on-write file system allows some applications to write configuration or initialization files where they want without rewriting the application and disturbing a local customizations.

The cited para. 258's mention that writes are handled on the client does not disclose a driver loaded onto client computers that intercepts a write to a shared file in the shared folder, to which the base computer added the shared application components, generates a mapping of the shared file to a local copy in the local device of the client, and then applies the write to the local copy. Although the cited para. 258 mentions writes handled on the client so that the client can rewrite without disturbing local customizations, this does not disclose that writes to a shared file in a shared folder, which has the shared application components, including executable files, used by the client computers to run the programs, are directed to a mapped-to local copy on the local devices of the clients.

Accordingly, claims 5, 18, and 31 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Patel.

Amended independent claims 7, 20, and 33 recite enabling access to the shared folders accessible over the network, wherein a shared file directory structure comprises a file directory structure of the shared folders; intercepting a write directed to a target shared file comprising one of the shared files in one of the shared folders; determining whether there is a mapping of the

target shared file in the shared folder to a local file in a local folder in the local device;  
generating a mapping of a file directory structure including the target shared file and the target shared file to a local copy of the file directory structure including the target shared file and the shared file in the local device in response to determining that there is no mapping of the file directory structure of the target shared file and target shared file to the local copy in the local device, wherein the local copy of the file directory structure provides a partial view of the shared file directory structure if target shared files in the shared file directory structure have not been accessed; and applying the write to the local copy of the shared file.

The added requirements to claims 7, 20, and 33 are disclosed in at least FIG. 3 and paras. 20 of the filed Specification.

The Examiner cited para. 142 of Patel as disclosing the pre-amended “generating a mapping” limitation (OA1, pg. 9), which as amended recites generating a mapping of a file directory structure including the target shared file and the target shared file to a local copy of the file directory structure including the target shared file and the shared file in the local device in response to determining that there is no mapping of the file directory structure of the target shared file and target shared file to the local copy in the local device, wherein the local copy of the file directory structure provides a partial view of the shared file directory structure if target shared files in the shared file directory structure have not been accessed. Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited para. 142 mentions a file spoof database at the client of a list of files the requests to which need to be redirected to the client streaming file system at the client. The client streaming file system servers all file system requests made by the application running on the client, and that reads and writes to files lead to page faults. A client cache manager is asked for the file and if it exists in the client cache, the client cache manager will get from there or forward to the application server if not local. See, para. 135 of Patel.

Patel discusses how files requested by the application are maintained locally at the client to use. The cited Patel does not disclose the claim requirements of building locally the file directory structure including a requested target shared file, wherein the local copy of the file directory structure provides a partial view of the shared file directory structure if target shared files in the shared file directory structure have not been accessed.

Accordingly, amended claims 7, 20, and 33 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Patel does not disclose all these claim requirements.

Claims 8-13, 21-26, and 34-39 are patentable over the cited art because the base claims 7, 20, and 33, from which they depend, are patentable over the cited art, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base and any intervening claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art. Moreover, the following claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 12, 25, and 38 depend from claims 11, 24, and 37, respectively, and further require that the read request is for requested data in one of the segments of the requested shared file, further comprising: determining whether the local copy of the requested shared file includes the segment having the requested data in response to determining that there is the mapping of the requested shared file to the local copy; accessing data from the segment including the requested data in the requested shared file in the shared folder over the network; returning the requested data from the accessed segment; and storing the accessed segment in the local copy of the requested shared file.

The Examiner cited para. 134 of Patel as disclosing the claim requirement of determining whether the local copy of the requested shared file includes the segment having the requested data in response to determining that there is the mapping of the requested shared file to the local copy. (OA1, pg. 11) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. 134 mentions a client cache manager that caches bits from the server so that a request made to the same bits can be served by the cache instead of going back to the server. If the client cache manager does not have the bits locally, it sends a request for the application bits.

The cited para. 134 does not disclose determining whether a local copy of a requested shared file includes the segments having the requested data. Instead, the cited para. 134 discusses a client cache manager providing requested bits. However, there is no mention that the client cache manager determines whether segments of a local copy of a requested shared file is in the client cache. The Examiner has not shown where Patel discloses that a determination is made of whether a local copy of a shared file includes segments or that the bits are retrieved if a local copy of a file already in the cache does not have the bits. The cited Patel does not disclose



determining or considering bits from a local copy of a shared file that is stored locally, instead the cited Patel discusses bits only.

Accordingly, amended claims 12, 25, and 38 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Patel does not disclose all these claim requirements.

### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-9, 11-22, 24-36, 38, and 39 are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: November 17, 2010

By:           /David Victor/          

David W. Victor  
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: (310) 553-7977  
Fax: 310-556-7984